

Remarks

Claims 22 and 33 have been amended to more clearly define the invention. Claim 38 has been amended to correct an error.

Claims 22-38 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as anticipated by US 2004/0193513 to Pruss et al. The Examiner is requested to reconsider this rejection in view of this amendment.

This application relates to a method and system for processing user requests for credit based network access, in which a user is given an opportunity to re-authenticate access when his account runs low. Nowhere do Pruss et al show or suggest:

“said user transmitting a re-authentication request in response to said credit parameter value reaching a threshold value to cause a re-authentication to occur”,

as specifically set forth in Claim 22 as amended. Rather, in Pruss et al, it is the SSG 114 which sends a re-authorization request on behalf of the user when the authorized value or “quota” reaches zero. The instant invention allows the user to use a credit card or other means to replenish his credit parameter value. It is therefore clear that Pruss et al does not affect the patentability of Claim 22 as amended.

Claims 23 to 26 are dependent from Claim 22 and add further advantageous features. The Applicants submit that these subclaims are patentable as their parent Claim 22.

Similarly, nowhere do Pruss et al show or suggest:

“receiving said user credentials from said user in response to a re-authentication request for re-authenticating said credit based network access”,

as specifically set forth in Claim 33 as amended. Rather, as set forth above, in Pruss et al, user credentials are received from SSG 114, not from a user. It is therefore clear that the patentability of Claim 33 is not affected by Pruss et al.

Claims 34 to 36 are dependent from Claim 33 and add further advantageous features. The Applicants submit that these subclaims are patentable as their parent Claim 33.

Similarly, nowhere do Pruss et al. show or suggest:

“said access point to initiate a re-authentication process upon expiration of a timer corresponding to said parameter value by requiring a user associated with a client device to re-provide user credentials to permit re-authentication before one of granting and denying further credit based network access”,

as specifically set forth in Claim 37. Rather, as set forth above, in Pruss et al, re-authentication is performed by SSG 114, not by a user. It is therefore clear that Pruss et al does not affect the patentability of Claim 37.

Claim 27 is dependent from Claim 37 and adds a further advantageous feature. The Applicants submit that Claim 27 is readable as its parent Claim 37.

Similarly, nowhere do Pruss et al show or suggest:

“to cause initiation of a re-authentication processor upon expiration of a timer corresponding to said parameter value by requiring a user associated with a client device to re-provide user credentials to permit re-authentication before one of granting and denying further credit based network access”,

as specifically recited in Claim 38. It is therefore clear that Pruss et al do not affect the patentability of Claim 38.

Claims 28 to 32 are dependent from Claim 38, and add further advantageous features. The Applicants submit that these subclaims are patentable as their parent Claim 38.

No fee is believed to have been incurred by virtue of this amendment, other than the fee for an extension of the period for response. However if a further fee is incurred on the basis of this amendment, please charge such fee against Deposit Account 07-0832.

The Applicants submit that this application is now in condition for allowance. A notice to that effect is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
Sachin Satish Mody,
Saurabh Mathur,
Charles Chuanming Wang

/Daniel E. Sragow/

by Daniel E. Sragow
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 22,856
609/734-6832

THOMSON Licensing Inc.
Patent Operation
PO Box 5312
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312

Date: 28 May 2009